



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	ICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/603,101 06/24/2003		06/24/2003	Yasuhiro Oki	U014693-7	1661		
140	7590	03/25/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER		
LADAS &			SHAH, M.	SHAH, MANISH S			
26 WEST 61ST STREET NEW YORK, NY 10023				ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER			
	- <b>,</b> - · · - ·			2853			

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	· ·	Application N	0.	Applicant(s)						
			<b>.</b>							
	Office Action Summary	10/603,101		OKI ET AL.						
	t carrier of the carr	Examiner		Art Unit						
	The MAII ING DATE of this communication a	Manish S. Sha		2853 orrespondence addre	988					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply										
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).										
Status										
1)🛛 🗆	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24	June 2003.								
· <u> </u>	<u></u>	nis action is non-f	inal.							
-	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.									
Disposition of Claims										
5) \( \begin{array}{c} 4 \\ 6 \emptyred{\text{N}} & \text{0} \\ 7 \emptyred{\text{C}} & \text{0} \\ 7 \emptyred{\text{C}} & \text{0} \\ \empty	4) ☐ Claim(s) 12-15,26 and 27 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 12-15 and 27 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.									
Application	on Papers									
•	he specification is objected to by the Examir									
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.										
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).										
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.										
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119									
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 10/103,661.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>										
Attachment(		_	_							
	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) [								
3) 🛛 Inform	ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/06 No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/24/03</u> .	8) 5) [ 6) [	Notice of Informal P	atent Application (PTO-15	52)					

Application/Control Number: 10/603,101 Page 2

Art Unit: 2853

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Specification

1. The examiner suggests that applicants include the structural formula of the compound of formula (1) in the abstract.

## Claim Objections

2. Claim 26 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 26 is depend on claim 16, and claim 16 is cancel in preliminary amendment submitted on 06/24/2003. So claim 26 should be cancel also. Appropriate correction is required.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 12-15 & 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a hydrazide compound of the formulas R<sup>5</sup>CXNHNR<sup>6</sup>R<sup>7</sup>, R<sup>5</sup>SO<sub>2</sub>NHNR<sup>6</sup>R<sup>7</sup>, and R<sup>5</sup>NHCXNHNR<sup>6</sup>R<sup>7</sup> (wherein the R groups and the X group are defined in the claims), does not reasonably provide enablement for hydrazide type compounds. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/603,101 Page 3

Art Unit: 2853

The claims recite hydrazide group compounds. This encompasses any compound containing a hydrazide group. However, the specification only teaches the use of three-hydrazide group containing compounds. Such a limited disclosure does not support the breadth of the instant claims.

## **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 4. Claims 12-15 & 27 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 7-8 & 31-34 of copending Application No. 10/103,651. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the present application overlap the copending application claims and would be obvious thereby.
- 5. Claims 12-15 & 27 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 12-15 & 29 of

Art Unit: 2853

copending Application No. 10/103,661. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the present application overlap the copending application claims and would be obvious thereby.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### Conclusion

- 6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- (1) Taguchi (# JP 11-170686) discloses the image recording material including ink absorbing layer on a ink jet recording sheet, which contains a compound represented by the formula as shown below (see Abstract).

$$\frac{x_1}{x_2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i \right)$$

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manish S. Shah whose telephone number is (571) 272-2152. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen D. Meier can be reached on (571) 272-2149. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/603,101

Art Unit: 2853

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manish S. Shah Examiner Art Unit 2853 Page 5

MSS 3/15/04